arXiv:1405.7616v1 [math.NA] 29 May 2014

A POSTERIORI ANALYSIS OF DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN SCHEMES FOR SYSTEMS OF HYPERBOLIC CONSERVATION LAWS

JAN GIESSELMANN[†] ¶ ‖, CHARALAMBOS MAKRIDAKIS[‡] ¶, AND TRISTAN PRYER[§] ¶ **

Abstract. In this work we construct reliable a posteriori estimates for some discontinuous Galerkin schemes applied to nonlinear systems of hyperbolic conservation laws. We make use of appropriate *reconstructions* of the discrete solution together with the *relative entropy* stability framework.

The methodology we use is quite general and allows for a posteriori control of discontinuous Galerkin schemes with standard flux choices which appear in the approximation of conservation laws.

In addition to the analysis, we conduct some numerical benchmarking to test the robustness of the resultant estimator.

1. Introduction. Hyperbolic conservation laws play an important role in many physical and engineering applications. One example is the description of non-viscous compressible flows by the Euler equations. Hyperbolic conservation laws in general only have smooth solutions up to some finite time even for smooth initial data. This makes their analysis and the construction of reliable numerical schemes challenging. The development of discontinuities poses significant challenges to their numerical simulation. Several successful schemes were developed so far and are mainly based on finite differences, finite volume and discontinuous Galerkin (dG) finite element schemes. For an overview on these schemes we refer to [GR96, Krö97, LeV02, Coc03, HW08] and their references. In this work we are interested in a posteriori error control of hyperbolic systems while solutions are still smooth. Our main tools are appropriate reconstructions of the discontinuous Galerkin schemes considered and relative entropy estimates.

The first systematic a posteriori analysis for numerical approximations of scalar conservation laws accompanied with corresponding adaptive algorithms, can be traced back to [KO00, GM00], see also [Coc03, DMO07] and their references. These estimates were derived by employing Kruzkov's estimates. A posteriori results for systems were derived in [Laf08, Laf04] for front tracking and Glimm's schemes, see also [KLY10]. For recent a posteriori analysis for well balanced schemes for a damped semilinear wave equation we refer to [AG13].

We aim at providing a rigorous a posteriori error estimate for semidiscrete dG schemes applied to systems of hyperbolic conservation laws which are of optimal order. The extension of these results to fully discrete schemes is obviously an important point but exceeds the scope of the work at hand. Our analysis is based on an extension of the reconstruction technique, developed mainly for discretisations of parabolic problems, see [Mak07] and references therein, to space discretisations in the hyperbolic setting. The main idea of the reconstruction technique is to introduce an intermediate function, which we will denote $\widehat{u}$, which solves a *perturbed* partial differential equation (PDE). This perturbed PDE is constructed in such a way that this $\widehat{u}$ is sufficiently close to both the approximate solution, denoted u_h and the exact solution to the conservation law, denoted u. Then, typically

$$\|u - u_h\| \leq \|u - \widehat{u}\| + \|\widehat{u} - u_h\|\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\|\widehat{u} - u_h\|$ can be controlled explicitly and $\|u - \widehat{u}\|$ is estimated using perturbation stability techniques. For systems of hyperbolic conservation laws admitting a convex entropy the *relative*

[†]Institute of Applied Analysis and Numerical Simulation, University of Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 57, D-70563 Stuttgart, Germany (jan.giesselmann@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de)

[‡]School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Sussex, Brighton, BN1 9QH, UK, (C.Makridakis@sussex.ac.uk)

[§]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Whiteknights, PO Box 220, Reading, RG6 6AX, England UK, (T.Pryer@Reading.ac.uk)

¶The authors were supported by the the FP7-REGPOT project "ACMAC–Archimedes Center for Modeling, Analysis and Computations" of the University of Crete (FP7-REGPOT-2009-1-245749).

‖J.G. was also partially supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) via SFB TRR 75 "Tropfendynamische Prozesse unter extremen Umgebungsbedingungen".

**T.P. was also partially supported by the EPSRC grant EP/H024018/1 and an LMS travel grant 41214.

entropy technique, introduced in [Daf79, DiP79] provides a natural stability framework in the case where one of the two functions involved in the analysis is a Lipschitz solution of the conservation law. This technique is based on the fact that usually systems of hyperbolic conservation laws are endowed with an entropy/entropy flux pair. For conservation laws describing physical systems this notion of entropy follows from the physical one. The entropy/entropy flux pair gives rise to an admissibility condition for weak solutions, cf. Definition 2.1, which leads to the notion of entropy solutions. It can also be used to define the notion of relative entropy between two solutions. In case of a convex entropy the relative entropy can be used to control the L_2 distance. It can be used to obtain a stability result, Theorem 2.7, which implies uniqueness of Lipschitz solutions in the class of entropy solutions. One drawback of this stability framework is that a Gronwall type argument has to be employed such that the error estimate depends exponentially on time. There are two features of the relative entropy framework which need to be taken into account when constructing the reconstruction $\hat{u}$. If the relative entropy is to be used to compare $u, \hat{u}$ one of the two needs to be Lipschitz. As u may be discontinuous, $\hat{u}$ needs to be Lipschitz. Secondly, the relative entropy is an L_2 framework, thus, the residuals in the perturbed equation satisfied by $\hat{u}$ need to be in L_2.

Relative entropy techniques for the a priori error analysis of approximations of systems of conservation laws were first used in [AMT04]. For other works concerning analysis of schemes for systems of conservation laws see, e.g. [JR05, JR06]. For discontinuous Galerkin/Runge–Kutta (dGRK) schemes a priori estimates can be found in [ZS04, ZS10]. In [HH02] the authors use a goal oriented framework providing error indicators for a space-time dG scheme. These indicators are computable, provided that certain dual problems are well posed. Asymptotic nodal superconvergence is investigated in a series of papers, see [BA11] and references therein. In [DMO07] the authors provide an a posteriori estimate for the L_1 error of dGRK schemes approximating a scalar conservation law, see also [Ohl09] for an overview on a posteriori error analysis for hyperbolic conservation laws.

The novelty of this work is that it provides a posteriori estimates for dG schemes for nonlinear *systems* of conservation laws. Notice we do not assume anything on the exact solution apart from the fact that it takes values on a compact set known a priori. That said, the final estimate is *conditional,* i.e., holds under assumptions on the approximation and its reconstruction, see [MN06, Mak07], which can be verified a posteriori. It must be noted, however, that our estimates are essentially valid before the formation of shocks. In the case where the entropy solution is discontinuous, our error estimator does not converge to zero if the meshwidth goes to zero. This is explained in detail in Remark 5.7 and is an expected direct consequence of the fact that in the relative entropy framework the Lipschitz constant of one of the solutions, which are compared to each other, enters the error estimate. The extension of our approach to the case of non-smooth solutions is a very challenging problem which is currently under investigation. The need of introducing reconstruction operators imposes some restrictions on the permitted discrete fluxes used in the dG method, see Remark 3.1. We present our analysis in the one dimensional case. An extension of our results to several space dimensions would require a generalised reconstruction technique while the other arguments would be analogous.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In §2 we give some background on hyperbolic conservation laws and their stability via the relative entropy method. In §3 we describe the numerical schemes under consideration. In §4 we provide some background on reconstruction methods and we discuss the reconstruction procedure which we employ here and study its properties. In §5 we combine the reconstruction and the relative entropy methodology to derive an a posteriori error estimate. Finally, in §6 we show some numerical experiments employing the estimates derived in §5, studying their asymptotic properties.

2. Preliminaries, conservation laws and relative entropy. Given the standard Lebesgue space notation [Cia02, Eva98] we begin by introducing the Sobolev spaces. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ then

$$\mathrm{W}_p^k(\Omega) := \{\phi \in \mathrm{L}_p(\Omega) : \ \mathrm{D}^\alpha \phi \in \mathrm{L}_p(\Omega), \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq k\}, \tag{2.1}$$

which are equipped with norms and seminorms

$$\|u\|_{\mathrm{W}^k_p(\Omega)} := \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|\le k} \|\mathrm{D}^\alpha u\|^p_{\mathrm{L}_p(\Omega)}\right)^{1/p} & \text{if } p \in [1,\infty) \\ \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} \|\mathrm{D}^\alpha u\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(\Omega)} & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

$$|u|_{\mathrm{W}^k_p(\Omega)} := \left\|\mathrm{D}^k u\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_p(\Omega)} \tag{2.3}$$

respectively, where derivatives $\mathrm{D}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are understood in a weak sense.

We use the convention that when derivatives act on a vector valued multivariate function, $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d)^{\mathsf{T}}$, it is meant componentwise, that is $\partial_x \boldsymbol{u} = (\partial_x u_1, \dots, \partial_x u_d)^{\mathsf{T}}$ denotes a column vector. The derivative of a field, q say, with respect to the dependent variable is denoted $\mathrm{D}q = (\partial_{u_1} q(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \partial_{u_d} q(\mathbf{u}))$ is a row vector. The matrix of second derivatives of q is

$$\mathrm{D}^2 q(\mathbf{u}) := \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{u_1,u_1} q(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \partial_{u_1,u_d} q(\mathbf{u}) \\ \vdots \qquad \ddots \qquad \vdots \\ \partial_{u_d,u_1} q(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \partial_{u_d,u_d} q(\mathbf{u}) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.4}$$

For a vector field $\boldsymbol{f}$, we denote its Jacobian by $\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{f}$ which is also a $d \times d$ matrix and its Hessian as $\mathrm{D}^2\mathbf{f}$ which is given as a 3–tensor. We also make use of the following notation for time dependent Sobolev (Bochner) spaces:

$$\mathrm{L}_\infty(0,T;\mathrm{W}^k_p(\Omega)) := \left\{ u : [0,T] \to \mathrm{W}^k_p(\Omega) : \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{\mathrm{W}^k_p(\Omega)} < \infty \right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ convex be the state space. We consider the following first order (system of) conservation law(s)

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}(x,t) + \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}(x,t)) = 0 \text{ for } (x,t) \in (0,1)\times(0,\infty). \tag{2.6}$$

We complement (2.6) with the following initial and boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{u}(0,t) = \mathbf{u}(1,t) \text{ for } t \in (0,\infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u}(x,0) = \mathbf{u}_0(x) \text{ for } x \in (0,1) \tag{2.7}$$

for some function $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathrm{L}_\infty((0,1),U)$. The solution, which in general is only in $\mathrm{L}_\infty((0,1)\times(0,\infty),U)$, takes values in the state space and we assume the flux function $\mathbf{f} : U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is at least $\mathrm{C}^2(U)$.

In particular, in our estimates, the assumed regularity will depend on the polynomial degree of the employed dG method. Throughout this paper we will assume that there is an entropy/entropy-flux pair (η, q) with $\eta \in C^2(U,\mathbb{R})$ strictly convex and $q \in C^1(U,\mathbb{R})$ associated to (2.6) in such a way that

$$\mathrm{D}q = \mathrm{D}\eta \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}. \tag{2.8}$$

The existence of an entropy flux implies that

$$(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f})^{\mathsf{T}} \mathrm{D}^2\eta = \mathrm{D}^2\eta \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}. \tag{2.9}$$

It is readily verifiable that strong solutions of (2.6) satisfy the additional conservation law

$$\partial_t \eta(\mathbf{u}) + \partial_x q(\mathbf{u}) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

For general background on hyperbolic conservation laws the reader is refered to [Daf10, LeF02, c.f.]. Note that not every system of hyperbolic conservation laws admits a convex entropy/entropy flux pair, see [Daf10, Sec. 5.4], even if it is physically meaningful. The derivation of a posteriori error estimates for systems of hyperbolic conservation laws admitting only poly or quasiconvex

entropies is beyond the scope of this work. It is common that solutions of (2.6) develop discontinuities after finite time. This motivates developing a notion of *weak solution*. As weak solutions, which satisfy the equation in the distributional sense are not unique attention is restricted to so called *entropy solutions* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{L}_\infty((0,1)\times(0,\infty), U)$. The concept of entropy solution guarantees uniqueness of solutions for scalar problems and can be interpreted as enforcing that solutions are compatible with the 2nd law of thermodynamics. However, it is important to note that entropy solutions need not be unique for systems of conservation laws in multiple space dimensions even if these are endowed with a convex entropy, [DLS10]. In this context it should be noted that the relative entropy technique, see Lemma 2.7, guarantees uniqueness for entropy solutions if and only if they are Lipschitz. The notion of entropy solution can be motivated by the *vanishing viscosity* framework. Consider the regularised PDE

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) = \epsilon \partial_{xx} \mathbf{u}^\epsilon. \tag{2.11}$$

Inserting the solution of (2.11) into the conservation law (2.10) we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) + \partial_x q(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) &= \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \mathrm{D}q(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \\
&= \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\left(\epsilon\partial_{xx}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\right) + \mathrm{D}q(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \\
&= \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\left(\epsilon\partial_{xx}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\right) + \mathrm{D}q(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \\
&= \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\epsilon\partial_{xx}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \\
&= \epsilon\partial_x\left(\mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\right) - \epsilon\left(\mathrm{D}^2\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\right)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon \\
&\leq \epsilon\partial_x\left(\mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)\partial_x \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

The limit as $\epsilon \to 0$ yields the following definition

Definition 2.1 (entropy solution). *A function* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{L}_\infty((0,1)\times[0,\infty), U)$ *is said to be an* entropy solution *of the initial boundary value problem (2.6)–*(2.7)*, with associated entropy/entropy-flux pair* (η, q)*, if*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \mathbf{u}\cdot\partial_t \boldsymbol{\phi} + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u})\cdot\partial_x \boldsymbol{\phi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \mathbf{u}_0\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi}(\cdot,0)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(S^1\times[0,\infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u})\partial_t\phi + q(\mathbf{u})\partial_x\phi\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}_0)\phi(\cdot,0)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0 \quad \forall\, \phi \in C_c^\infty(S^1\times[0,\infty),[0,\infty)). \tag{2.14}$$

Here S^1 *(the 1–sphere) refers to the unit interval* $[0,1]$ *with matching endpoints.*

Remark 2.2 (scalar case). *In the scalar case entropy solutions are required to satsify* (2.14) *for every convex entropy/entropy flux pair.*

For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{L}_\infty((0,1)\times(0,\infty), U)$ the distribution $\partial_t\eta(\mathbf{u}) + \partial_x q(\mathbf{u})$ has a sign and therefore is a measure, i.e., we may replace the smooth test functions in Definition 2.1 by Lipschitz continuous ones. Stability of solutions and in particular uniqueness of Lipschitz solutions within the class of entropy solutions is obtained via relative entropy arguments, see [Daf10, Chapter 5] and references therein.

Definition 2.3 (relative entropy and entropy-flux). *We define the* relative entropy*,* $\eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v})$*, and* relative entropy-flux*,* $q(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v})$*, of two generic vector valued functions* $\mathbf{v}$ *and* $\mathbf{w}$ *with values in* U *to be*

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta(\mathbf{v}\,|\,\mathbf{w}) &:= \eta(\mathbf{v}) - \eta(\mathbf{w}) - \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{w})(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{w}) \\
q(\mathbf{v}\,|\,\mathbf{w}) &:= q(\mathbf{v}) - q(\mathbf{w}) - \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{w})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w})).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Note that $\eta(\mathbf{v}\,|\,\mathbf{w})$ *and* $q(\mathbf{v}\,|\,\mathbf{w})$ *are not symmetric in* $\mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{w}$.

Assumption 2.4 (values in a compact set). *We will assume throughout the paper that the exact solution* $\mathbf{u}$ *of* (2.6) *takes values in* $\mathfrak{O}$*,i.e.,*

$$u(x,t) \in \mathfrak{O} \quad \forall\ (x,t) \in (0,1)\times(0,\infty),$$

where $\mathfrak{O}$ be a compact and convex subset of U.

REMARK 2.5 (Bounds on flux and entropy). *Due to the regularity of $\mathbf{f}$ and η and the compactness of $\mathfrak{O}$ there are constants $0 < C_{\underline{\mathbf{f}}} < \infty$ and $0 < C_{\underline{\eta}} < C_{\overline{\eta}} < \infty$ such that*

$$\left|\mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathrm{D}^2 \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v}\right| \leq C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} |\mathbf{v}|^2, \qquad C_{\underline{\eta}} |\mathbf{v}|^2 \leq \mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v} \leq C_{\overline{\eta}} |\mathbf{v}|^2 \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{O}, \tag{2.16}$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean norm for vectors. Note that $C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}$, $C_{\underline{\eta}}$ and $C_{\overline{\eta}}$ can be explicitly computed from $\mathfrak{O}$, $\mathbf{f}$ and η.

LEMMA 2.6 (Gronwall inequality). *Given $T > 0$, let $\phi(t) \in \mathrm{C}^0([0,T])$ and $a(t), b(t) \in \mathrm{L}_1([0,T])$ all be nonnegative functions with b non-decreasing and satisfying*

$$\phi(t) \leq \int_0^t a(s)\phi(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + b(t). \tag{2.17}$$

Then

$$\phi(t) \leq b(t) \exp\left(\int_0^t a(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right) \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.18}$$

As we will make use of a similar argument to derive our error estimate let us give the proof of the following stability result which can be found in [Daf10].

LEMMA 2.7 (L_2–stability). *Let $\mathbf{u}$ be an entropy solution of (2.6)–(2.7) corresponding to initial data $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{v}$ a Lipschitz solution of (2.6)–(2.7) corresponding to initial data $\mathbf{v}_0$. Let $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ take values in $\mathfrak{O}$. Then there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t) - \mathbf{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \leq C_1 \exp(C_2 t) \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{v}_0\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}. \tag{2.19}$$

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{v}$ satisfies (2.14) as an equality. Thus, for any Lipschitz continuous, non negative test function ϕ we have

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi(\eta(\mathbf{u}) - \eta(\mathbf{v})) + \partial_x \phi(q(\mathbf{u}) - q(\mathbf{v}))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\,(\eta(\mathbf{u}_0) - \eta(\mathbf{v}_0))\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Using the definition of relative entropy and relative entropy flux, we may reformulate this as

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi\,(\eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v}) + \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{v})\,(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})) + \partial_x \phi\,(q(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v}) + \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{v})\,(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\,(\eta(\mathbf{u}_0) - \eta(\mathbf{v}_0))\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Upon using the Lipschitz continuous test function $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{v})$ in (2.13) for $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$, we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t(\phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{v}))(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}) + \partial_x(\phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{v}))(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u})-\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v}))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\mathrm{D}\eta(\mathbf{v}(\cdot,0))(\mathbf{u}_0-\mathbf{v}_0)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0. \tag{2.22}$$

We use the product rule in (2.22) and combine it with (2.21) to obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi \eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v}) + \partial_x \phi q(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\partial_t \mathbf{v} \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}) + \partial_x \mathbf{v} \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v}))) + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\eta(\mathbf{u}_0\,|\,\mathbf{v}_0)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0. \tag{2.23}$$

Using $\partial_t \mathbf{v} = -D\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})\partial_x \mathbf{v}$ and (2.9) we find

(2.24)
$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi \eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v}) + \partial_x \phi q(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\partial_x \mathbf{v} \mathrm{D}^2\eta(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v})) + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\eta(\mathbf{u}_0\,|\,\mathbf{v}_0)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0.$$

Now we fix $t > 0$. Then for every $0 < s < t$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we consider the test function

$$\phi(x,\sigma) = \begin{cases} 1 & : \quad \sigma < s \\ 1 - \frac{\sigma - s}{\varepsilon} & : \quad s < \sigma < s + \varepsilon \\ 0 & : \quad \sigma > s + \varepsilon \end{cases} . \tag{2.25}$$

In this case we infer from (2.24)

(2.26)
$$-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_s^{s+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\mathbf{v})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\partial_x \mathbf{v}\mathrm{D}^2\eta(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v})))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}_0\,|\,\mathbf{v}_0)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0.$$

When sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ we find for all points s of L_∞-weak-*-continuity of $\eta(\mathbf{u}(\cdot,\sigma))$ in $(0,t)$ that
(2.27)
$$-\int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}(x,s)\,|\,\mathbf{v}(x,s))\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^s \int_0^1 \partial_x \mathbf{v}\mathrm{D}^2\eta(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}_0\,|\,\mathbf{v}_0)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0.$$

Upon using (2.16) we infer that for almost all $s \in (0,t)$
(2.28)
$$C_{\underline{\eta}} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,s) - \mathbf{v}(\cdot,s)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \leq C_{\overline{\eta}} \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{v}_0\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} + C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} C_{\overline{\eta}} \int_0^s |\mathbf{v}(\cdot,\sigma)|_{W^{1,\infty}(I)} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,\sigma) - \mathbf{v}(\cdot,\sigma)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

This equation, in fact, holds for all $s \in (0,t)$ as $\mathbf{u}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous. Since $\mathbf{v}$ is Lipschitz continuous, applying Gronwall's Lemma completes the proof. □

3. The semi-discrete scheme. We will discretise (2.6) in space using consistent dG finite element methods. Let $I := [0,1]$ be the unit interval and choose $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = 1$. We denote $I_n = [x_n, x_{n+1}]$ to be the n–th subinterval and let $h_n := x_{n+1} - x_n$ be its size. Let $\mathbb{P}^p(I)$ be the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to p on I, then we denote

$$\mathbb{V}_p := \left\{ \mathbf{g} : I \to \mathbb{R}^d : \; g_i|_{I_n} \in \mathbb{P}^p(I_n) \text{ for } i = 1,\ldots,d, \; n = 0,\ldots,N-1 \right\}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathbf{g} = (g_1,\ldots,g_d)^\intercal$, to be the usual space of piecewise p–th degree polynomials for vector valued functions over I. In addition we define jump and average operators such that

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\mathbf{g}]\!]_n &:= \mathbf{g}(x_n^-) - \mathbf{g}(x_n^+) := \lim_{s \searrow 0} \mathbf{g}(x_n - s) - \lim_{s \searrow 0} \mathbf{g}(x_n + s), \\ \{\!\{\, \mathbf{g} \,\}\!\}_n &:= \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{g}(x_n^-) + \mathbf{g}(x_n^+)\right) := \frac{1}{2}\left(\lim_{s \searrow 0} \mathbf{g}(x_n - s) + \lim_{s \searrow 0} \mathbf{g}(x_n + s)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

We will examine the following class of semi-discrete numerical schemes where $\mathbf{u}_h \in C^1([0,T), \mathbb{V}_p)$ is determined such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \left(\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} + \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) \cdot [\![\boldsymbol{\phi}]\!]_n - [\![\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}]\!]_n\right) \qquad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_p. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

In the sequel we will assume that (3.3) has a solution and in particular that $\mathbf{u}_h$ takes values in U. We also set

$$[\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_0 := \mathbf{u}_h(x_N^-) - \mathbf{u}_h(x_0^+); \qquad \{\!\{ \mathbf{u}_h \}\!\}_0 := \frac{\mathbf{u}_h(x_0^+) + \mathbf{u}_h(x_N^-)}{2} \tag{3.4}$$

to account for the periodic boundary conditions. Here $\mathbf{F} : U^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a numerical flux function. We restrict our attention to a certain class of numerical flux functions. We impose that there exists a function

$$\mathbf{w} : U \times U \to U \text{ such that } \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})) \tag{3.5}$$

and that there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that $\mathbf{w}$ satisfies

$$|\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{u}| \le L\,|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|\,, \qquad |\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{v}| \le L\,|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| \quad \forall\, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in U. \tag{3.6}$$

REMARK 3.1 (restriction of fluxes). *The reason for the restriction on the choice of fluxes will be made aparant in the sequel. Our assumptions are met obviously by upwind as well as central fluxes for any system under consideration. This is also true for Godunov schemes employing exact Riemann solvers. For approximate Riemann solvers there are two classes [LeV02, Sec. 12.3]. Our assumption is generally satisfied for the class in which the numerical flux is computed by evaluating the exact flux on some intermediate state extracted from an approximate Riemann solution. For the second class, which encompasses e.g. the Roe scheme, the situation is more involved.*

Let us look at some numerical fluxes in special cases: In case of inviscid Burgers equation, i.e., $f(u) = \frac{u^2}{2}$, our condition is not satisfied for the local and global Lax–Friedrichs scheme. For the local Lax–Friedrichs scheme the numerical flux reads

$$F(u, v) = \frac{1}{2}(u^2 + v^2) + \max(|u|, |v|)(u - v) \tag{3.7}$$

which is negative for $u = 0$ and $v > 0$. Therefore there can be no $w \in U$ satisfying $f(w) = F(0, v)$. The argument for the global Lax–Friedrichs scheme is analogous.

For the inviscid Burger's equation both the Roe and the Engquist-Osher flux satisfy our condition, with

$$w_{EO}(a, b) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}a^2(1 + \operatorname{sgn}(a)) + \frac{1}{2}b^2(1 - \operatorname{sgn}(b))} \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$w_{Roe}(a, b) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}a^2(1 + \operatorname{sgn}(a + b)) + \frac{1}{2}b^2(1 - \operatorname{sgn}(a + b))}. \tag{3.9}$$

The situation is far more complicated for nonlinear systems. In fact, for the p-system which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u - \partial_x v &= 0 \\ \partial_t v - \partial_x p(u) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for some function p with $p' > 0$, the question whether the Roe scheme fits into our framework hinges on whether p is surjective.

4. Reconstruction and projection operators. To analyse the scheme (3.3) we introduce reconstructions which we denote by $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$. For brevity we will ommit the time dependency of all quantities in this section.

DEFINITION 4.1 (reconstruction of $\mathbf{u}_h$). *The reconstruction $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ is the unique element of $\mathbb{V}_{p+1}$ such that*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}\, \mathrm{d}x = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}\, \mathrm{d}x \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_{p-1} \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x_n^+) = \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) \text{ and} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x_{n+1}^-) = \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^+)) \quad \forall\, n \in [0, N-1]. \tag{4.3}$$

recalling that $\mathbf{u}_h(x_0^-) := \mathbf{u}_h(x_N^-)$, *and* $\mathbf{u}_h(x_N^+) := \mathbf{u}_h(x_0^+)$.

DEFINITION 4.2 (reconstruction of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)$). *The reconstruction* $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ *is the unique element of* $\mathbb{V}_{p+1}$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x \\ + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+))) \cdot [\![\boldsymbol{\phi}]\!]_n - [\![\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}]\!]_n \right) \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_p\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

coupled with the skeletal "boundary" conditions that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(x_n^+) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+))) \quad \forall\, n \in [0, N-1]\,. \tag{4.5}$$

LEMMA 4.3 (continuity and orthogonality). *The reconstructions* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *and* $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ *given in Definitions 4.1 and 4.2 respectively are continuous and* $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ *satisfies the orthogonality property*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \left(\widehat{\mathbf{f}} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \right) \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_{p-1}. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. The continuity of $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ follows from (4.2)–(4.3). To prove the continuity of $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ we choose $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ as the i-th unit vector on I_n and zero elsewhere. Then, upon letting $\widehat{\mathbf{f}} = \left(\widehat{f}_1, \ldots, \widehat{f}_d\right)^{\mathsf{T}}$ and $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_d)^{\mathsf{T}}$ we obtain from (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{f}_i(x_{n+1}^-) - \widehat{f}_i(x_n^+) = f_i(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-)) - f_i(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) - f_i(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+))) \\ + f_i(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^+))) + f_i(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) - f_i(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-)).\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

This implies

$$\widehat{f}_i(x_{n+1}^-) = f_i(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^+))) \tag{4.8}$$

due to (4.5). This shows the continuity of $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$. Using integration by parts in (4.4) we have that the boundary terms cancel due to our choice of $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(x_n^+)$ and (4.8). Hence, we find

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \widehat{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \partial_x \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \partial_x \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_p \tag{4.9}$$

concluding the proof. ∎

DEFINITION 4.4 (L_2 projection). *We define* $\mathcal{P}_p : [\mathrm{L}_2(I)]^d \to \mathbb{V}_p$ *to be the* L_2 *orthogonal projection to* $\mathbb{V}_p$, *that is,*

$$\int_I \boldsymbol{\psi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_I \mathcal{P}_p(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_p. \tag{4.10}$$

If $\psi \in \mathrm{W}_\infty^{p+1}(I)$ *the operator is well known [Cia02, c.f.] to satisfy the following estimate in* L_∞*:*

$$\|\psi - \mathcal{P}_p \psi\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \leq C_p h_n^{p+1} \, |\psi|_{\mathrm{W}_\infty^{p+1}} \quad \forall\, n = 0, \ldots, N-1. \tag{4.11}$$

REMARK 4.5 (restriction of fluxes revisited). *The assumption on the numerical flux functions* (3.5) *is posed such that we can choose our reconstructions* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}, \widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ *such that* $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(x_n) = \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x_n))$ *for all* n. *This is needed for the proof of Lemma 5.9 and it will be elaborated upon in Remark 5.10.*

5. Error estimates. In this section we make use of the reconstruction operators from §4 to construct a posteriori bounds for the generic numerical scheme (3.3). Using these reconstructions we can rewrite our scheme as

$$0 = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{V}_p. \tag{5.1}$$

Since we have that $\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h$ and $\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ are piecewise polynomials of degree p we may write (5.1) as a pointwise equation

$$\partial_t \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) = \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{f}} + \partial_t \widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \partial_t \mathbf{u}_h =: \mathbf{R}. \tag{5.2}$$

Using the relative entropy technique we obtain the following preliminary error estimate:

LEMMA 5.1 (error bound for the reconstruction). *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be the entropy solution of* (2.6),(2.7) *then the difference between* $\mathbf{u}$ *and the reconstruction* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\underline{\eta}} \left\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,s) - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,s)\right\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} &\le C_{\overline{\eta}} \left\|\mathbf{u}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0\right\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \\ &\quad + (C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} C_{\overline{\eta}} \left\|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + C^2_{\overline{\eta}}) \int_0^s \left\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,\sigma) - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,\sigma)\right\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \,\mathrm{d}\sigma + \left\|\mathbf{R}\right\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I\times(0,s))} \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

for every $s \in (0,\infty)$, *provided* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *takes values in* $\mathfrak{O}$.

Proof. Since $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ is Lipschitz continuous, we multiply (5.2) by $\mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})$ and find for any Lipschitz continuous, non negative test function ϕ

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi(\eta(\mathbf{u}) - \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})) + \partial_x \phi(q(\mathbf{u}) - q(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})) - \phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\mathbf{R} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\big(\eta(\mathbf{u}_0) - \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0)\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \ge 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Using the definition of relative entropy and relative entropy flux, we may reformulate this as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi(\eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) + \mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}})) + \partial_x \phi(q(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) + \mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}))) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\mathbf{R} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\big(\eta(\mathbf{u}_0) - \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0)\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Using the Lipschitz continuous test function $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})$ in (2.13) and (5.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t(\phi D\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}))(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) + \partial_x(\phi D\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}))(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})) - \phi \mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\mathbf{R} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\mathrm{D}\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,0))(\mathbf{u}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0) \,\mathrm{d}x = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

We use the product rule in (5.6) and combine it with (5.5) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi \eta(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) + \partial_x \phi q(\mathbf{u}\,|\,\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\partial_t \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \mathrm{D}^2\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) + \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \mathrm{D}^2\eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}))) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot,0)\eta(\mathbf{u}_0\,|\,\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0) \,\mathrm{d}x \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Using the fact that $\partial_t \widehat{\mathbf{u}} = -\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{R}$ and (2.9) we find

$$\begin{aligned}(5.8)\qquad &\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \partial_t \phi \eta(\mathbf{u} \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) + \partial_x \phi q(\mathbf{u} \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}} D^2 \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - D\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}))) \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}})^\intercal D^2 \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \mathbf{R} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \phi(\cdot, 0) \eta(\mathbf{u}_0 \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0) \,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now we fix $t > 0$, then for every $0 < s < t$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we consider the test function $\phi(x, \sigma)$ given in (2.25). In this case we infer from (2.24)

$$\begin{aligned}(5.9)\qquad &-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_s^{s+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u} \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}))) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \phi(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}})^\intercal \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \mathbf{R} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}_0 \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0) \,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

When sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ we find for all points s of L_∞-weak-*-continuity of $\eta(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \sigma))$ in $(0, t)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}(5.10)\qquad &-\int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}(x, s) | \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, s)) \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^s \int_0^1 \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}})) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad - \int_0^s \int_0^1 (\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}})^\intercal \mathrm{D}^2 \eta(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \mathbf{R} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \eta(\mathbf{u}_0 \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0) \,\mathrm{d}x \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Upon using (2.16) and the convexity of $\mathfrak{O}$ we infer that for almost all $s \in (0, t)$

$$\begin{aligned}(5.11)\qquad C_{\underline{\eta}} \left\| \mathbf{u}(\cdot, s) - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot, s) \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}^2 &\leq C_{\overline{\eta}} \left\| \mathbf{u}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0 \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}^2 \\ &+ (C_{\mathbf{f}} C_{\overline{\eta}} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + C_{\overline{\eta}}^2) \int_0^s \left\| \mathbf{u}(\cdot, \sigma) - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot, \sigma) \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}^2 \,\mathrm{d}\sigma + \left\| \mathbf{R} \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I \times (0,s))}^2.\end{aligned}$$

This equation, in fact, holds for all $s \in (0, t)$ as $\mathbf{u}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous. □

Remark 5.2 (values of $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$). *Note that the condition that $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ takes values in $\mathfrak{O}$ can be verified in an a posteriori fashion, as $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ can be explicitly computed.*

Let us note that $\mathbf{R}$ can be explicitly computed locally in every cell using only information from that cell and traces from the adjacent cells. Still we would like to estimate $\left\| \mathbf{R} \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_2}^2$ by quantities only involving $\mathbf{u}_h$. There are two reasons for doing this: Firstly we expect the new bound to be computationally cheaper. Secondly, we will use this new form to argue why we expect our estimator to be of optimal order. To bound $\left\| \mathbf{R} \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_2}^2$ by $\mathbf{u}_h$ only, it is imperative to have precise information on $\mathbf{u}_h - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}$. To this end we introduce the Legendre polynomials together with some of their properties.

Proposition 5.3 (Legendre polynomials). *Let l_k denote the k-th Legendre polynomial on $(-1, 1)$, and l_k^n its transformation to the interval I_n, i.e.,*

$$(5.12)\qquad l_k^n(x) = l_k\left(2\left(\frac{x - x_n}{h_n}\right) - 1\right).$$

Let $\alpha_k := \partial_x l_k(1)$. Then l_k^n has the following properties

$$(5.13)\qquad (-1)^k l_k^n(x_n) = l_k^n(x_{n+1}) = 1,$$

$$(5.14)\qquad (-1)^{k+1} h_n \partial_x l_k^n(x_n) = h_n \partial_x l_k^n(x_{n+1}) = 2\alpha_k,$$

$$(5.15)\qquad \int_{I_n} l_j^n(x) l_k^n(x) \,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{2h_n}{2k+1} \delta_{kj} \leq h_n,$$

$$(5.16)\qquad |l_k^n(x)| \leq 1 \ \forall x \in I_n.$$

LEMMA 5.4. *The reconstruction $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ given by Definition 4.1 satisfies the following representation for all $x \in I_n$*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h\right)(x) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(& (-1)^p \left(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) - \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)\right) \\
& + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^+)) - \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-)\Big) l_p^n(x) \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\Big(& (-1)^{p+1} \left(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) - \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)\right) \\
& + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^+)) - \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-)\Big) l_{p+1}^n(x)
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.17}
$$

where l_p^n and l_{p+1}^n are the rescaled Legendre polynomials from Proposition 5.3. Therefore,

$$
\|\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)}^2 \leq L^2 h_n \left(\left| [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_n \right|^2 + \left| [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \tag{5.18}
$$

and

$$
\left\| \partial_x^k \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \leq \left\| \partial_x^k \mathbf{u}_h \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} + L \frac{1}{h_n^k} b_k \left(\left| [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_n \right| + \left| [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_{n+1} \right| \right) \tag{5.19}
$$

where $b_k := |l_p|_{k,\infty} + |l_{p+1}|_{k,\infty}$.

Proof. Letting $\widehat{\mathbf{u}} = (\widehat{u}_1, \ldots, \widehat{u}_d)^{\mathsf{T}}$ and $\mathbf{u}_h = ((u_h)_1, \ldots, (u_h)_d)^{\mathsf{T}}$ and writing $\widehat{u}_i|_{I_n}$ and $(u_h)_i|_{I_n}$ as linear combinations of Legendre polynomials we see that (4.1) implies

$$
(\widehat{u}_i - (u_h)_i)(x) = \alpha l_p^n(x) + \beta l_{p+1}^n(x) \quad \forall\, x \in I_n \tag{5.20}
$$

for real numbers α, β depending on i and n. Using (5.13) and the boundary conditions on $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ (4.2)–(4.3) we obtain

$$
\alpha(-1)^p - \beta(-1)^p = \widehat{u}_i(x_n^+) - (u_h)_i(x_n^+) = w_i(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+)) - (u_h)_i(x_n^+) \tag{5.21}
$$

and

$$
\alpha + \beta = \widehat{u}_i(x_{n+1}^-) - (u_h)_i(x_{n+1}^-) = w_i(\mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_{n+1}^+)) - (u_h)_i(x_{n+1}^-). \tag{5.22}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{bmatrix} (-1)^p & (-1)^{p+1} \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} (-1)^p & 1 \\ (-1)^{p+1} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{5.23}
$$

we obtain (5.17). Equations (5.18) and (5.19) are immediate consequences of (5.17) upon using (5.13)–(5.16). ∎

THEOREM 5.5. *Let $\mathbf{f} \in \mathrm{C}^2(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy (2.10) and let $\mathbf{u}$ be an entropy solution of (2.6) with periodic boundary conditions. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ take values in $\mathfrak{O}$, then for $0 \leq t \leq T$ the error between the numerical solution $\mathbf{u}_h$ and $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t) - \mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}^2 \leq{}& 2L^2 \sum_n h_n \left(\left| [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_n \right|^2 + \left| [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \\
& + 2C_{\underline{\eta}}^{-1} \Big(\|\mathbf{R}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I\times(0,t))}^2 + C_{\overline{\eta}} \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}^2 \Big) \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{C_{\overline{\eta}} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,s)\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I)} + C_{\overline{\eta}}^2}{C_{\underline{\eta}}} \,\mathrm{d}s \right).
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.24}
$$

Proof. Combining Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 5.1 we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t)-\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,t)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \le C_{\underline{\eta}}^{-1}\Big(\|\mathbf{R}\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I\times(0,t))}+C_{\overline{\eta}}\|\mathbf{u}_0-\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_0\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}\Big) \times \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{C_{\overline{\eta}}C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}\|\partial_x\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,s)\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I)}+C_{\overline{\eta}}^2}{C_{\underline{\eta}}}\,\mathrm{d}s\right). \tag{5.25}$$

Upon using triangle inequality and (5.18) equation (5.25) implies the assertion of the Theorem. ∎

REMARK 5.6 (values of $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$). *The* L_∞ *estimates based on* (5.17) *can be employed to verify a posteriori that* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *takes values in* $\mathfrak{O}$.

REMARK 5.7 (discontinuous entropy solutions). *The estimate in Theorem 5.5 does not require the entropy solution* $\mathbf{u}$ *to be continuous. However, in case* $\mathbf{u}$ *is discontinuous* $\|\partial_x\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,s)\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I)}$ *is expected to behave like* $\mathrm{O}(h^{-1})$. *Therefore, the estimator in* (5.24) *will (at best) be* $\mathrm{O}(h^{p+1}\exp(h^{-1}))$ *which diverges for* $h\to 0$. *Thus, the estimator in* (5.24) *is expected not to converge for* $h\to 0$ *if the entropy solution is discontinuous. The same is true for the estimator derived in Theorem 5.12. This is a consequence of the use of the relative entropy framework and the fact that the entropy solution does not need to be unique if it is not Lipschitz.*

LEMMA 5.8 (inverse inequality [Cia02, c.f.]). *For every* $k\in\mathbb{N}$ *there is a constant* $C_{inv}>0$ *such that for any interval* $J\subset\mathbb{R}$ *and any* $\phi\in\mathbb{P}^k(J)$ *the following inequality is satisfied*

$$\|\partial_x\phi\|_{L^2(J)} \le \frac{C_{inv}}{|J|}\|\phi\|_{L^2(J)}. \tag{5.26}$$

LEMMA 5.9 (a posteriori control on $\mathbf{R}$). *Let* $\mathbf{f}\in\mathrm{C}^{p+2}(U,\mathbb{R}^d)$ *and satisfy (2.16). It then holds that*

$$\|\mathbf{R}\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \le 3(E_1+E_2+E_3) \tag{5.27}$$

with

(5.28)

$$E_1 := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_n L^2\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\partial_t\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|^2+\left|\left[\!\left[\partial_t\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^2\right),$$

$$E_2 := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 4h_nL^2\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|^2+\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^2\right)\left(L\frac{\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|+\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|}{h_n}+\|\partial_x\mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)}\right)C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} + 2h_n\left(\sum_{k=0}^{p}\binom{p+1}{k}\left(h_n^{p+1}\left\|\partial_x^{k+1}\mathbf{u}_h\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)}+Lh_n^{p-k}b\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|+\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|\right)\right) \times\left|\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right|\right)^2,$$

$$E_3 := 2C_{inv}^2L^2C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}^2|\mathbf{u}_h|^2_{W^{1,\infty}}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}h_n\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|^2+\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^2\right) + 16C_{inv}^2L^4C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}^2\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{1}{h_n}\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|^4+\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^4\right)$$

where $b := \|l_p\|_{W^{p+1,\infty}}+\|l_{p+1}\|_{W^{p+1,\infty}}$.

Proof. Recalling the definition of $\mathbf{R}$

$$\mathbf{R} := \partial_t\widehat{\mathbf{u}}+\partial_x\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) = \partial_x\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})-\partial_x\widehat{\mathbf{f}}+\partial_t\widehat{\mathbf{u}}-\partial_t\mathbf{u}_h, \tag{5.29}$$

we begin by splitting $\mathbf{R}$ into three quantities via the L_2 projection of $\partial_x\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})$, that is,

$$\mathbf{R} = \partial_t\left(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_h\right)+\left(\partial_x\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})-\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})_x\right)\right)+\left(\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})_x\right)-\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_x\right) =: \mathbf{R}_1+\mathbf{R}_2+\mathbf{R}_3, \tag{5.30}$$

and bounding each of these individually.

Forming the time derivative of (5.18) we immediately obtain

$$\|\mathbf{R}_1\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} = \|\partial_t(\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} \leq L^2 h_n \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right). \tag{5.31}$$

For the term involving $\mathbf{R}_2$ we further split the term and evaluate derivatives, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_p\left(\partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\right) - \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} &\leq \|\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right) - \mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} \\ &\leq 2\,\|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)}\, C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}\, \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

since the L_2-projection is stable and satisfies $\|\mathcal{P}_p g\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \|g\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}$ for any $g \in \mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)$. In addition from (4.11) we have that

$$\|\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \leq C_p h_n^{p+1} \left|\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right|_{\mathrm{W}^{p+1}_\infty(I_n)}. \tag{5.33}$$

By the product rule we have inside I_n

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^{p+1}\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right) &= \sum_{k=0}^{p+1} \binom{p+1}{k} \left(\partial_x^{k+1}\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right)\left(\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{p} \binom{p+1}{k} \left(\partial_x^{k+1}\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right)\left(\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

as $\widehat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{V}_{p+1}$. Using the properties of the derivatives of the reconstruction (5.19) in (5.34) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h_n^{p+1}\left\|\partial_x^{p+1}\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_x\right)\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} &\leq h_n^{p+1} \sum_{k=0}^{p} \binom{p+1}{k} \left\|\partial_x^{k+1}\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \left\|\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{p} \binom{p+1}{k} \Big(h_n^{p+1} \left\|\partial_x^{k+1}\mathbf{u}_h\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \\ &\qquad + L h_n^{p-k} b_{k+1} \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right| + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right| \right) \Big) \left\|\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

Inserting (5.35) into (5.33) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{P}_p\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\right) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \\ &\qquad \leq C_p \sum_{k=0}^{p} \Bigg(\binom{p+1}{k} \Big(h_n^{p+1} \left\|\partial_x^{k+1}\mathbf{u}_h\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \\ &\qquad\qquad + L h_n^{p-k} b_{k+1} \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right| + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right| \right) \Big) \left\|\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

Therefore, we can infer from (5.32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{R}_2\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I_n)} &\leq 8 C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} L^2 h_n \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \\ &\quad + 2 C_p^2 h_n \Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{p} \binom{p+1}{k} \Big(h_n^{p+1} \left\|\partial_x^{k+1}\mathbf{u}_h\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \\ &\qquad + h_n^{p-k} b_{k+1} \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right| + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right| \right) \left\|\partial_x^{p+1-k}\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \Big) \Bigg)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

Using the fact that

$$\|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \leq L \frac{\left|\, [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_n \,\right| + \left|\, [\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_{n+1} \,\right|}{h_n} + \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \tag{5.38}$$

equation (5.37) implies the desired estimate for $\|\mathbf{R}_2\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)}$.

To conclude we will estimate the term containing $\mathbf{R}_3$. Note that $\mathbf{R}_3 \in \mathbb{V}_p$. Using the definitions of $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ as well as integration by parts we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{R}_3\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} |\mathbf{R}_3|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \left(\mathcal{P}_p\left(\partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}})\right) - \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{f}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{R}_3 \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \left(\partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - \partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{f}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{R}_3 \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \left(\partial_x \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - \partial_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right) \cdot \mathbf{R}_3 \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\qquad - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{u}_h(x_n^-), \mathbf{u}_h(x_n^+))) \cdot [\![\mathbf{R}_3]\!]_n + [\![\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \mathbf{R}_3]\!]_n\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

Now upon integrating by parts, we see that

$$\|\mathbf{R}_3\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} = -\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \left(\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right) \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{R}_3 \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{5.40}$$

Using the orthogonality property (4.1) taking $\phi = \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{P}_0 \mathbf{u}_h)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{R}_3\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{I_n} \Big[\left(\mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{P}_0 \mathbf{u}_h) - \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h)\right)(\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}|=2} \left(\frac{2}{\boldsymbol{\beta}!} \int_0^1 (1-t) \mathrm{D}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h + t(\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h)) \,\mathrm{d}t\right) (\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h)^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \Big] \partial_x \mathbf{R}_3 \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq C_{inv} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} |\mathbf{u}_h|_{\mathrm{W}^1_\infty} \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \|\mathbf{R}_3\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \\
&\qquad + C_{inv} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{h_n^2} \int_{I_n} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h|^4 \,\mathrm{d}x} \, \|\mathbf{R}_3\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.41}$$

by the inverse inequality (5.8), where $\mathrm{D}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\mathbf{f}$ is the partial derivative of $\mathbf{f}$ specified by the multiindex $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Note that $|\mathbf{u}_h|_{\mathrm{W}^1_\infty}$ in (5.41) is to be understood as $\max_{n=1,\ldots,N} |\mathbf{u}_h|_{I_n}|_{\mathrm{W}^1_\infty(I_n)}$. Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{R}_3\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \leq C_{inv} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \left(|\mathbf{u}_h|_{\mathrm{W}^1_\infty} \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} + \sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{h_n^2} \int_{I_n} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_h|^4 \,\mathrm{d}x} \right). \tag{5.42}$$

In view of the boundedness of the Legendre polynomials and (5.17) this implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{R}_3\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \leq C_{inv} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \Big(|\mathbf{u}_h|_{\mathrm{W}^1_\infty} \sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_n L^2 \left(\left|[\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_n\right|^2 + \left|[\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_{n+1}\right|^2\right)} \\
+ \sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{h_n} L^4 \left(\left|[\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_n\right|^4 + \left|[\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]_{n+1}\right|^4\right) \mathrm{d}x} \Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.43}$$

concluding the proof. ☐

REMARK 5.10 (general numerical fluxes). *The assumption on the numerical fluxes* (3.5) *was used in the above proof in order to estimate* R_3. *If we used more general numerical fluxes we would get additional contributions in the estimate* (5.39) *which would not be of optimal order in general. In particular, it is not sufficient for the numerical fluxes to be consistent and monotone.*

LEMMA 5.11 (stability of the reconstruction). *Let* $\mathbf{f} \in \mathrm{C}^{p+2}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ *satisfy (2.10) and let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be an entropy solution of* (2.6) *with periodic boundary conditions. Then, provided* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *takes values in* $\mathfrak{O}$, *for* $0 \le t \le T$ *the error between the reconstruction* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *and* $\mathbf{u}$ *satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t) - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,t)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \le C_{\underline{\eta}}^{-1} E(t) \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{C_{\overline{\eta}} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,\sigma)\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I)} + C_{\overline{\eta}}^2}{C_{\underline{\eta}}} \,\mathrm{d}\sigma \right) \tag{5.44}$$

with

(5.45)

$$\begin{aligned}
E(t) := {} & C_{\overline{\eta}} \eta(\mathbf{u}(\cdot,0) \,|\, \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,0))) \\
& + \int_0^t 3 \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_n \Bigg[L^2 \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \\
& + 4L^2 \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \left(L \frac{\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right| + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|}{h_n} + \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} \right) C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \\
& + 2 \Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{p} \binom{p+1}{k} \left(h_n^{p+1} \left\| \partial_x^{k+1} \mathbf{u}_h \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)} + |h_n|^{p-k} L b_k \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right| + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right| \right) \right) \\
& \qquad \times \left\| \partial_x^{p+1-k} \mathrm{D}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h) \right\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(\Omega)} \Bigg)^2 \\
& + 2 C_{inv}^2 C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}^2 \, |\mathbf{u}_h|^2_{W^{1,\infty}} \, L^2 \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \\
& + 16 C_{inv}^2 C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}}^2 \frac{1}{h_n^2} L^4 \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^4 + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^4 \right) \Bigg] \mathrm{d}s,
\end{aligned}$$

All the quantities inside the integral on the right hand side of (5.45) *are evaluated at time* s.

Proof. The proof follows by combining Lemmas 5.1 and 5.9. ☐

THEOREM 5.12 (a posteriori error estimate). *Let* $\mathbf{f} \in \mathrm{C}^{p+2}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ *and* $\mathbf{u}$ *be the entropy solution of* (2.6) *with periodic boundary conditions. Let* $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$ *takes values in* $\mathfrak{O}$. *Then for* $0 \le t \le T$ *the error between the numerical solution* $\mathbf{u}_h$ *and* $\mathbf{u}$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t) - \mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(I)} \le {} & C_{\underline{\eta}}^{-1} E(t) \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{C_{\overline{\eta}} C_{\overline{\mathbf{f}}} \|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,\sigma)\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I)} + C_{\overline{\eta}}^2}{C_{\underline{\eta}}} \,\mathrm{d}\sigma \right) \\
& + L^2 \sum_n h_n \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t) \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t) \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.46}$$

where E *is defined as in Lemma 5.11.*

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.11. ☐

REMARK 5.13 (optimality of the estimator). *Assume that the entropy solution* $\mathbf{u}$ *and its time derivative* $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$ *are* $p+1$ *times continuously differentiable in space and*

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(0,T;\mathrm{L}_2(I))} + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u} - \partial_t \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(0,T;\mathrm{L}_2(I))} \le C h^{p+1}. \tag{5.47}$$

In that case it is expected that $\|\partial_x \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(0,T;\mathrm{L}_\infty(I))}$ *is bounded uniformly in* h *and, moreover, the arguments from [MN06, Rem 3.6] indicate that*

$$\sum_n h_n \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \le C h^{2p+2} \text{ and } \sum_n h_n \left(\left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_n \right|^2 + \left| \left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h \right]\!\right]_{n+1} \right|^2 \right) \le C h^{2p+2}$$

where $h = \max_n h_n$. *As, in addition,*

$$\frac{1}{h_n}\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right| + \left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|\right)$$

is expected to be bounded, we expect E *in* (5.46) *to be of order* h^{2p+2} *and the exponential term in* (5.46) *to be bounded uniformly in* h. *Therefore, we claim that our error estimator is of optimal order, for sufficiently smooth solutions. This is supported by numerical evidence in Section 6.*

REMARK 5.14. *As can be seen in [Daf10] the relative entropy stability estimate in Lemma 2.7 can be localized in the sense that there is a computable* $c > 0$ *depending on* $\mathfrak{D}$ *such that for every* $[a, b] \subset I$ *and* $t > 0$

$$\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t) - \mathbf{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2([a,b])} \leq C_1 \exp(C_2 t)\, \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{v}_0\|_{\mathrm{L}_2([a-ct,b+ct])}\,. \tag{5.48}$$

with C_2 *depending on* $\|\partial_x \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(\{(x,s):x\in[a-cs,b+cs]\})}$. *This, in particular, shows that the arguments presented above allow for the construction of localized a posteriori error estimates.*

6. Numerical experiments. In this section we study the numerical behaviour of the error indicators and compare this behaviour with the true error on two model problems. The coding was done in Matlab ® under the framework provided by [HW08].

DEFINITION 6.1 (estimated order of convergence). *Given two sequences* $a(i)$ *and* $h(i) \searrow 0$, *we define estimated order of convergence (*EOC*) to be the local slope of the* $\log a(i)$ *vs.* $\log h(i)$ *curve, i.e.,*

$$\mathrm{EOC}(a,h;i) := \frac{\log(a(i+1)/a(i))}{\log(h(i+1)/h(i))}. \tag{6.1}$$

REMARK 6.2 (computed a posteriori indicator). *We define*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{E}_t := \widetilde{E}(t) \exp\left(\int_0^t \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,\sigma)\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I)} + \frac{1}{h_n}\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t)\right]\!\right]_n\right| + \left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t)\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|\right) \mathrm{d}\sigma\right) \\ + \sum_n h_n \left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t)\right]\!\right]_n\right|^2 + \left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h(\cdot,t)\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^2\right),\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{E}(t) := \eta(\mathbf{u}(\cdot,0)\,|\,\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot,0))) + \int_0^t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_n \Bigg[\left(\left|\left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|^2 + \left|\left[\!\left[\partial_t \mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^2\right) \\ + \left(\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right|^2 + \left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|^2\right)\left(\frac{\left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_n\right| + \left|\left[\!\left[\mathbf{u}_h\right]\!\right]_{n+1}\right|}{h_n} + \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(I_n)}\right)\Bigg].\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Note that $\mathscr{E}_t$ *is equivalent to the bound in Lemma 5.12 up to a constant in view of inverse inequalities. As such,* $\mathscr{E}_t$ *is an* aposteriori indicator.

DEFINITION 6.3 (effectivity index). *The main tool deciding the quality of an estimator is the effectivity index (*EI*) which is the ratio of the error and the estimator, i.e.,*

$$\mathrm{EI}(t_n) := \frac{\max_t \mathscr{E}_t}{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(0,T;\mathrm{L}_2(S^1))}}. \tag{6.4}$$

In both tests below for the temporal discretisation we choose an explicit fourth order Runge-Kutta method. To test the asymptotic behaviour of the estimator given in Theorem 5.12 we use a uniform timestep and uniform meshes that are fixed with respect to time. Hence for each test we have $\mathbb{V}^n = \mathbb{V}^0 = \mathbb{V}$ and $\tau_n = \tau(h)$ for all $n \in [1:N]$. We fix the polynomial degree p and two parameters k, c and then compute a sequence of solutions with $h = h(i) = 2^{-i}$, and $\tau = ch^k$ for a sequence of refinement levels $i = l, \ldots, L$.

Table 1: In this test we computationally study the behaviour of the a posteriori indicator when the exact solution to the problem is given by (6.6). Note that this solution is only valid *before* shock formation, as such u is smooth.

(a) A simulation with $p = 1$.

N	$\|e_u\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(\mathrm{L}_2)}$	EOC	$\max_t \mathscr{E}_t$	EOC	EI
8	2.3336e-01	0.000	3.5500e-01	0.000	1.521
16	8.6657e-02	1.429	1.3541e-01	1.390	1.563
32	3.1863e-02	1.443	5.1422e-02	1.397	1.614
64	1.1753e-02	1.439	1.9416e-02	1.405	1.652
128	4.2916e-03	1.453	7.1950e-03	1.432	1.677
256	1.5501e-03	1.469	2.6220e-03	1.456	1.692
512	5.5526e-04	1.481	9.4403e-04	1.474	1.700
1024	1.9779e-04	1.489	3.3723e-04	1.485	1.705
2048	7.0216e-05	1.494	1.1990e-04	1.492	1.708
4096	2.4879e-05	1.497	4.2518e-05	1.496	1.709

(b) A simulation with $p = 2$.

N	$\|e_u\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(\mathrm{L}_2)}$	EOC	$\max_t \mathscr{E}_t$	EOC	EI
8	2.2135e-02	0.000	9.5664e-02	0.000	0.000
16	2.7472e-03	3.010	1.4455e-02	2.726	5.262
32	3.4615e-04	2.988	2.1409e-03	2.755	6.185
64	4.4617e-05	2.956	3.3881e-04	2.660	7.594
128	5.6079e-06	2.992	5.1629e-05	2.714	9.207
256	7.0465e-07	2.992	7.4392e-06	2.795	10.557
512	8.8207e-08	2.998	1.0230e-06	2.862	11.598
1024	1.1040e-08	2.998	1.3598e-07	2.911	12.317

6.4. Test 1 : The scalar case - inviscid Burger's equation. We conduct a benchmarking experiment using the inviscid (scalar) Burger's equation, i.e.,

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x \left(\frac{u^2}{2} \right) = 0. \tag{6.5}$$

Using an initial condition $u(x,0) = -\sin(x)$ over an interval $I = [-\pi, \pi]$. It can be verified that, before shock formation, the exact solution can be represented by an infinite sum of Bessel functions, that is,

$$u(x,t) = -2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k(kt)}{kt} \sin(kx), \tag{6.6}$$

where J_k denotes the $k-th$ Bessel function. Note this is a decaying sequence, hence we may approxmiate the solution by taking a truncation of this series.

We discretise the problem (6.5) using the dG scheme (3.3) together with Engquist–Osher type fluxes. These fluxes satisfy the assumptions (3.5)–(3.6) as shown in Remark 3.1. Table 1 summarises the results for this test.

6.5. Test 2 : The system case - the p–system. In this case we conduct some benchmarking using the p–system, given by:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_t u - \partial_x v \\ 0 &= \partial_t v - \partial_x (p(u)). \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Table 2: In this test we computationally study the behaviour of the a posteriori indicator applied to the p–system.

(a) A simulation with $p = 1$.

N	$\|e_u\|_{\mathrm{L}_\infty(\mathrm{L}_2)}$	EOC	$\max_t \mathscr{E}_t$	EOC	EI
16	1.5296e+00	0.000	3.2527e+00	0.000	2.126
32	5.6355e-01	1.441	1.2362e+00	1.396	2.194
64	2.0724e-01	1.443	4.6672e-01	1.405	2.252
128	7.5565e-02	1.455	1.7283e-01	1.433	2.287
256	2.7373e-02	1.465	6.3085e-02	1.454	2.305
512	9.7873e-03	1.484	2.2669e-02	1.477	2.316

We choose an initial condition $u(x,0) = \exp\left(-10\,|x|^2\right)$ and $v(x,0) = 0$ over an interval $I = [-5,5]$.

We discretise (6.7) using the dG scheme (3.3) with a Roe flux (as described in Remark 3.1). This class of fluxes satisfies the assumption on the fluxes (3.6) assuming p is surjective. We take $p(u) = u^3 + u$.

We run the simulation on a sufficiently refined mesh and timestep to generate an accurate approximation to the solution and test the approximation rates for the method using this as a representation to the exact solution. Table 2 summaries the results for this test.

REFERENCES

[AG13] Debora Amadori and Laurent Gosse. Error estimates for well-balanced and time-split schemes on a damped semilinear wave equation. *Preprint*, 2013.

[AMT04] Christos Arvanitis, Charalambos Makridakis, and Athanasios E. Tzavaras. Stability and convergence of a class of finite element schemes for hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 42(4):1357–1393, 2004.

[BA11] Mahboub Baccouch and Slimane Adjerid. Discontinuous Galerkin error estimation for hyperbolic problems on unstructured triangular meshes. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 200(1-4):162–177, 2011.

[Cia02] Philippe G. Ciarlet. *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, volume 40 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2002. Reprint of the 1978 original [North-Holland, Amsterdam; MR0520174 (58 #25001)].

[Coc03] Bernardo Cockburn. Continuous dependence and error estimation for viscosity methods. *Acta Numer.*, 12:127–180, 2003.

[Daf79] C. M. Dafermos. The second law of thermodynamics and stability. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 70(2):167–179, 1979.

[Daf10] Constantine M. Dafermos. *Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics*, volume 325 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 2010.

[DiP79] Ronald J. DiPerna. Uniqueness of solutions to hyperbolic conservation laws. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 28(1):137–188, 1979.

[DLS10] Camillo De Lellis and László Székelyhidi, Jr. On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 195(1):225–260, 2010.

[DMO07] Andreas Dedner, Charalambos Makridakis, and Mario Ohlberger. Error control for a class of Runge-Kutta discontinuous Galerkin methods for nonlinear conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(2):514–538, 2007.

[Eva98] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.

[GM00] Laurent Gosse and Charalambos Makridakis. Two a posteriori error estimates for one-dimensional scalar conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 38(3):964–988, 2000.

[GR96] Edwige Godlewski and Pierre-Arnaud Raviart. *Numerical approximation of hyperbolic systems of conservation laws*, volume 118 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[HH02] Ralf Hartmann and Paul Houston. Adaptive discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for nonlinear hyperbolic conservation laws. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 24(3):979–1004 (electronic), 2002.

[HW08] Jan S. Hesthaven and Tim Warburton. *Nodal discontinuous Galerkin methods*, volume 54 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2008. Algorithms, analysis, and applications.

[JR05] Vladimir Jovanović and Christian Rohde. Finite-volume schemes for Friedrichs systems in multiple space dimensions: a priori and a posteriori error estimates. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 21(1):104–131, 2005.

[JR06] Vladimir Jovanović and Christian Rohde. Error estimates for finite volume approximations of classical solutions for nonlinear systems of hyperbolic balance laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(6):2423–2449 (electronic), 2006.

[KLY10] H. Kim, M. Laforest, and D. Yoon. An adaptive version of Glimm's scheme. *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B Engl. Ed.*, 30(2):428–446, 2010.

[KO00] Dietmar Kröner and Mario Ohlberger. A posteriori error estimates for upwind finite volume schemes for nonlinear conservation laws in multidimensions. *Math. Comp.*, 69(229):25–39, 2000.

[Krö97] Dietmar Kröner. *Numerical schemes for conservation laws*. Wiley-Teubner Series Advances in Numerical Mathematics. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1997.

[Laf04] M. Laforest. A posteriori error estimate for front-tracking: systems of conservation laws. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 35(5):1347–1370, 2004.

[Laf08] M. Laforest. An a posteriori error estimate for Glimm's scheme. In *Hyperbolic problems: theory, numerics, applications*, pages 643–651. Springer, Berlin, 2008.

[LeF02] Philippe G. LeFloch. *Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002. The theory of classical and nonclassical shock waves.

[LeV02] Randall J. LeVeque. *Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[Mak07] Charalambos Makridakis. Space and time reconstructions in a posteriori analysis of evolution problems. In *ESAIM Proceedings. Vol. 21 (2007) [Journées d'Analyse Fonctionnelle et Numérique en l'honneur de Michel Crouzeix]*, volume 21 of *ESAIM Proc.*, pages 31–44. EDP Sci., Les Ulis, 2007.

[MN06] Charalambos Makridakis and Ricardo H. Nochetto. A posteriori error analysis for higher order dissipative methods for evolution problems. *Numer. Math.*, 104(4):489–514, 2006.

[Ohl09] Mario Ohlberger. A review of a posteriori error control and adaptivity for approximations of non-linear conservation laws. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids*, 59(3):333–354, 2009.

[ZS04] Qiang Zhang and Chi-Wang Shu. Error estimates to smooth solutions of Runge-Kutta discontinuous Galerkin methods for scalar conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 42(2):641–666 (electronic),

2004.

[ZS10] Qiang Zhang and Chi-Wang Shu. Stability analysis and a priori error estimates of the third order explicit Runge-Kutta discontinuous Galerkin method for scalar conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 48(3):1038–1063, 2010.